

Appl. No. : **08/835,732**
Filed : **April 11, 1997**

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-9, 12-13 and 15-20 are pending in this application. In the December 16, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner objects to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-13 and 15-20. In particular, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-13, and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-13, and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

In addition, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 11, 15-17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,548,271 (the "Tsuchiyama patent"). The Examiner rejects Claims 6, 9, 12-13 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchiyama in view of Figure 2 of Applicant's present application and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,661,578 (the "Habing patent"). The Examiner further rejects Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchiyama in view of Figure 2 of Applicant's present application and with or without U.S. Patent No. 5,128,781 (the "Ohno patent").

In response to the rejections, Applicant has cancelled Claims 2 and 11 without prejudice or disclaimer and has amended Claims 1, 4, 8, 16-17 and 20. For the reasons presented below, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 4-9, 12-13 and 15-20 are now in condition for allowance.

OBJECTION TO SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objects to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. In particular, the Examiner states that Claims 1, 16-17 and 20 recite a limitation of "the transmissive material provides a casing and structure for handling by a user" and further states that the limitation is not disclosed in the original disclosure.

As of this Amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 16-17 and 20 to not include the limitation referenced by the Examiner. By amending these claims to remove this limitation, Applicant is not acknowledging that the limitation is not supported by the disclosure.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 4-9, 12-13 and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, as failing to comply with the written description requirement and as being indefinite. As previously discussed, Applicant has amended the Claims 1, 16-17, and 20 to not include the limitation referenced by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections with respect to 35 U.S.C. § 112.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 15-17 and 20

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 15-17 and 20 as being unpatentable over Tsuchiyama. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Focusing on amended independent Claim 1, in one embodiment of Applicant's invention a computer display is disclosed. In particular, the computer display comprises, among other things, a LCD housing made in a single piece from a single light transmissive material, a light source, and a LCD. The light source is embedded in the LCD housing. In addition, the LCD housing is coupled directly to a back surface of the LCD and at least partially encloses the back surface and edges of the LCD. The LCD housing is also structured so as to conduct light to the LCD while, at the same time, protecting the LCD.

Tsuchiyama does not appear to teach a computer display having a LCD housing as recited in amended Claim 1. In particular, Tsuchiyama does not appear to disclose an LCD housing made from a single light transmissive material that: (1) is structured so as to have a light source embedded within the housing and (2) is directly coupled to a back surface of an LCD and at least partially encloses the back surface and edges of the LCD. Rather, Tsuchiyama appears to disclose a data display pager in which LEDs (12a,12b) are positioned next to a light conducting plate (38) situated in a reflection frame (36). With reference to Figure 3B, the LCD (12) of Tsuchiyama does not have a back surface that is coupled to a LCD housing made from a single light transmissive material. In addition, the LCD (12) does not have a back surface and edges that are at least partially enclosed by the LCD housing. As shown in Figure 3B, neither the light

Appl. No. : **08/835,732**
Filed : **April 11, 1997**

conducting plate (38) nor the reflection frame (30) is coupled to or partially encloses the LCD (12).

Because the reference cited by the Examiner does not disclose, teach or suggest a LCD housing as recited in amended Claim 1, Applicants assert that amended Claim 1 is not obvious in view of Tsuchiyama. Applicants respectfully request allowance of amended Claim 1.

Independent Claims 16, 17 and 20 are believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those set forth with respect to the patentability of independent Claim 1 and for the different aspects recited therein.

Claims 4–5, 7 and 15–16 depend from independent Claim 1 and are believed to be patentable for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 6, 9, 12–13 and 18–19

The Examiner rejects Claims 6, 9, 12–13 and 18–19 as being unpatentable over Tsuchiyama in view of Figure 2 of Applicant's present application and in further view of Habing.

Claims 6, 9 and 12–13 depend from independent Claim 1 and are believed to be patentable for the reasons set forth above with respect to the patentability of Claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 18 and 19 depend from independent Claim 17 and are believed to be patentable for the reasons set forth above with respect to the patentability of Claim 17 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 8

The Examiner rejects Claim 8 as being unpatentable over Tsuchiyama in view of Figure 2 of Applicant's present application and with or without Ohno.

Claim 8 depends from independent Claim 1 and is believed to be patentable for the reasons set forth above with respect to the patentability of Claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

AMENDMENT TO CLAIM 4

Applicant notes that Claim 4 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Amended Claim 4 now recites "emissions" and not "emssions."

Appl. No. : 08/835,732
Filed : April 11, 1997

REQUEST FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 713.01, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant's undersigned attorney of record hereby formally requests a telephone interview with the Examiner as soon as the Examiner has considered the effect of the arguments presented above. Applicant's attorney can be reached at (949) 721-2998 or at the general office number listed below.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If further issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned such that any remaining issues may be promptly resolved.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 3/15/04

By: John R. King
John R. King
Registration No. 34,362
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

H:\DOCS\CAF\CAF-2341.DOC
021704